

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

TRAMAINE D. JERNIGAN,

Petitioner,

v.

CV 10-701 MCA/CG

LAWRENCE JARAMILLO, et al.

Respondents.

**ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

**THIS MATTER** is before the Court upon *Petitioner's Motion for Extension of Time* (Motion). (Doc. 20). Petitioner seeks an extension of time to file his objections to the Magistrate Judge's Proposed Findings and Recommended Disposition ('PFRD'). (*Id.*). The Court, being fully advised in this matter, finds Petitioner's Motion not to be well taken and will **DENY** the Motion as moot.

This Court filed Proposed Findings and Recommended Disposition on December 22, 2010. (Doc. 13). Petitioner was informed that he had fourteen days within which to object to the Magistrate Judge's PFRD. Petitioner responded to the PFRD with an untitled response (Doc. 16), which the Court construed as a motion requesting the appointment of counsel. (Doc. 17 at 1). The Court denied Petitioner's request for appointed counsel on February 7, 2011, but did grant Petitioner a final twenty-one day extension of time to file his objections to the PFRD. Petitioner then filed objections to the PFRD on February 18, 2011, which is well within the twenty one day extension afforded Petitioner by this Court's last order.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that *Petitioner's Motion for Extension of Time* (Doc.

20) be **DENIED** as moot.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Carmen E. Garza", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

---

THE HONORABLE CARMEN E. GARZA  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE